

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/030,330

Applicant(s)

TRAVIS ET AL.

Examiner

William W. Moore

Art Unit

1652

All Participants:(1) William W. Moore, Examiner.(2) Lorin D. Albin, Applicant's Counsel.**Status of Application:** _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 June 2004**Time:** 2:00PM EST**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejections of record under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims discussed:

Claims 1-16, 19-23, 25-29, and 31-35

Prior art documents discussed:

*None***Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature) _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) _____

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Reconsideration by the examiner of the degree of stringency of the hybridization and wash conditions stated in claim 23 prompted a proposal by the examiner to Applicant's counsel that at least the rejected claims 1, 8, 19, 27 and 29 be amended to depend from claim 23 and that the polynucleotide claims 25 and 26 be amended to delete limitations pertaining to anything but the amino acid positions of SEQ ID NO:1 in the clauses following the preambles of these claims, so that they too would fall within the scope of claim 23. Cancellation of any claims that might conflict with the amendments to claims 1, 8, 19, 27 and 29, and amendment of any dependent claim to ensure that it would fall within the scope of claim 23 was also recommended, in order to place the elected claims in condition for allowance..